

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of av@total-knowledge.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:53 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Anatoly Volynets
<CONTACT-EMAIL> av@total-knowledge.com
<ADDRESS1> 1257 Oak Creek Way
<CITY> Sunnyvale
<STATE> California
<ZIP> 94089-2327
<PHONE> 408-730-2531
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The "broadcast flag" is just another monster born by ill conceived copyright idea. The Framers understood that publishing monopolies did undermine freedom of speech and press, progress of science and arts. They wanted to balance this obvious for any sane mind damage by incentives to creators. The simple assertion was that damage caused by restrictions on dissemination will be counterbalanced by increased "productivity" of creators. It was one out of many known historical mistakes. It does not work this way. The irony of the situation is that in the age of Enlightenment said mistake could not be clearly seen. To clean up all the mess brought in by copyrights is important job of our generation. Instead, we move in opposite direction. Why do we do this? Why?!

If we go where we go, we will end up with meters on our mouths, sending request on each said word to some Hollywood developed authority to verify "copyrightness" and make automatic withdrawal from our accounts. Copyrighted silence will count either. Why do we want this for ourselves and our children? Why?!

It was quite natural in pragmatic XVIII century to oversee those natural and understandable facts that people talk for free, write for free, sing for free, play for free out of one and only one absolutely human desire: to communicate with each other. It was natural in that pragmatic age to think that material push may help those highly valuable for society human activities. And this was a tragic mistake. But what is going on now? Do we try to fix it? No, we try to deep it! Why? Why we forgot the intention to promote progress of science and arts and try to promote abnormal proprietary relations where they do not belong even according to the Constitution? Why?!

It was natural blindness not to believe that normally free cultural development can pay to creators. But it can. This has been proved many times! That means, that society can ameliorate those abilities with respective laws so that everybody would win. Why our lawmakers do not bother to work in this obviously beneficial for entire society direction? Why?!

Restrictions put on the culture by copyrights and derivative ideas and measures will harm culture in this country as bad as direct restrictions have harmed culture in each single totalitarian society throughout the history. And this will be even worse here. In communist USSR people of culture knew that they fight against inhumane rule by their work. Here they are law obeying citizens. That is United States of America is going to kill culture by the hands of creators. Why do we do this? Why?!

Why all of the related to the issue laws, regulations, acts, measures are not checked against the constitutional goal: To Promote Progress of Science and useful Arts? Why?!

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of paulmonsour@rcn.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:53 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Paul Monsour
<CONTACT-EMAIL> paulmonsour@rcn.com
<ADDRESS1> 23 Waverly Pl., Apt. 4N
<CITY> New York
<STATE> NY
<ZIP> 10003
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I urge you to reject the adoption of the "broadcast flag" for digital television broadcasts. This means of limiting replay of a recorded broadcast infringes on civil liberties as well as hinders the development and implementation of technological advances.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of aseatanner@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:53 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> A.C.Tanner
<CONTACT-EMAIL> aseatanner@yahoo.com
<ADDRESS1> 12309 Melody Turn
<CITY> Bowie
<STATE> MD
<ZIP> 20715
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology. The idea of the broadcast flag is to implement universal content control and abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. The broadcast flag is theft. I oppose NPRM 02-230.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of j_post@pacbell.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:53 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Jeff Post
<CONTACT-EMAIL> j_post@pacbell.net
<ADDRESS1> 22726 Benner Ave
<CITY> Torrance
<STATE> CA
<ZIP> 90505
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Please reject the proposal to implement the "broadcast flag". Greedy media moguls already have too much control over what consumers can do with their own equipment. They view us as nothing more than sheep to be sheared at their convenience and for their benefit. Too many of our fair rights have been eroded. The government should fight for the rights of citizens, rather than for corporations who will do anything to milk us of every dime we've got. Citizens do not exist for the benefit of corporations--it's the other way around!

Thank you.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jfbauer@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:53 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Jim Bauer

<CONTACT-EMAIL> jfbauer@comcast.net

<ADDRESS1> 8212 Hilton Road

<CITY> Gaithersburg

<STATE> MD

<ZIP> 20882

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I strongly encourage you to decide against the "broadcast flag" requirement that has been proposed. The "broadcast flag" will seriously undermine the freedom and flexibility in how broadcasted material is accessed and used. The public has come to enjoy, expect, and deserve to make these choices on their own. This "broadcast flag" will only serve to punish the innocent.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jfbauer@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2003 3:23 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Jim Bauer

<CONTACT-EMAIL> jfbauer@comcast.net

<ADDRESS1> 8212 Hilton Road

<CITY> Gaithersburg

<STATE> MD

<ZIP> 20882

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I strongly encourage you to decide against the "broadcast flag" requirement that has been proposed. The "broadcast flag" will seriously undermine the freedom and flexibility in how broadcasted material is accessed and used. The public has come to enjoy, expect, and deserve to make these choices on their own. This "broadcast flag" will only serve to punish the innocent.

Stephanie Kost

From: Evan Deaubl [eff@warpedview.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 3:41 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Evan Deaubl
9852 E. Forest Grove Loop
Tucson, AZ 85749
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: ball@pobox.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 2:45 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/31/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Robert Ball

<CONTACT-EMAIL> ball@pobox.com

<ADDRESS1> 4136 Plum Ridge Dr

<CITY> Ypsilanti

<STATE> MI

<ZIP> 48197

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I am entirely and completely opposed to implementation of the Digital Broadcast Flag in consumer electronics. No industry should have such power over what citizens of this country can, and cannot, own. Mandating that hardware can only be built if it is crippled is counter to the spirit of invention and experimentation that made this country great. That cannot be destroyed by nothing more than the whims of short-sighted commercial groups.

Stephanie Kost

From: Michael Tatlow [mtatlow@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 1:15 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Michael Tatlow
17 Condict Place
Morristown, NJ 07960
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of dianna487@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:27 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> dianna morton

<CONTACT-EMAIL> dianna487@comcast.net

<ADDRESS1> 27 B Conwell Street

<CITY> provincetown

<STATE> ma

<ZIP> 02657

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The movie industry should not have a special privilege to own fully-functional digital television devices. This would abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology. The broadcast flag is theft. Dianna Morton

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of videopaul@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:27 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> james paul ludwig
<CONTACT-EMAIL> videopaul@comcast.net
<ADDRESS1> 27 B Conwell Street
<CITY> provincetown
<STATE> ma
<ZIP> 02657
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> The movie industry should not have a special privilege to own fully-functional digital television devices. This would abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology. The broadcast flag is theft. James Ludwig

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of adb@friedbagels.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:27 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Aaron Read
<CONTACT-EMAIL> adb@friedbagels.com
<ADDRESS1> 34 Kirkwood Rd
<CITY> Boston
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02135
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The broadcast flag should NEVER be adopted.. There are two simple reasons why: first, it's one step away from fascism. We're supposed to have more freedom with the digital revolution, not less: We're supposed to have more choice with the digital revolution, not less. When big business/big media tells me that something that takes away my freedom is good for me, well, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to know they're lying to me.

Second, a more pragmatic reason. It won't work. You can't legislate technology into control. You'd think Hollywood and the media industry in general would've learned this by now with file-sharing. You can make it illegal, you can sue people into oblivion, but anything that millions upon millions of people do on a daily basis can't be illegal anymore - it's a reality, deal with it. Any encryption, any hardware blocker, anything that tries to stop people will be defeated and in less than a month.

Ultimately, that will be WORSE for industry as you'll have millions of TV's and other media devices that the rest of the world won't touch. It will drive up manufacturing costs and stifle innovation at the same time. It's a lose-lose-lose situation: DON'T ADOPT THE BROADCAST FLAG!!!

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of videopaul@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2003 5:02 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/25/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> james paul ludwig

<CONTACT-EMAIL> videopaul@comcast.net

<ADDRESS1> 27 B Conwell Street

<CITY> provincetown

<STATE> ma

<ZIP> 02657

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The movie industry should not have a special privilege to own fully-functional digital television devices. This would abolish the right of free citizens to own effective tools for employing digital content in useful ways. Hollywood and content producers must not be allowed to determine the rights of the public to use flexible information technology. The broadcast flag is theft. James Ludwig

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of adb@friedbagels.com
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2003 7:29 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Aaron Read
<CONTACT-EMAIL> adb@friedbagels.com
<ADDRESS1> 34 Kirkwood Rd
<CITY> Boston
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02135
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> The broadcast flag should NEVER be adopted. There are two simple reasons why: first, it's one step away from fascism. We're supposed to have more freedom with the digital revolution, not less. We're supposed to have more choice with the digital revolution, not less. When big business/big media tells me that something that takes away my freedom is good for me, well, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to know they're lying to me.

Second, a more pragmatic reason. It won't work. You can't legislate technology into control. You'd think Hollywood and the media industry in general would've learned this by now with file-sharing. You can make it illegal, you can sue people into oblivion, but anything that millions upon millions of people do on a daily basis can't be illegal anymore - it's a reality, deal with it. Any encryption, any hardware blocker, anything that tries to stop people will be defeated and in less than a month.

Ultimately, that will be WORSE for industry as you'll have millions of TV's and other media devices that the rest of the world won't touch. It will drive up manufacturing costs and stifle innovation at the same time. It's a lose-lose-lose situation: DON'T ADOPT THE BROADCAST FLAG!!!

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of tedanderson@mindspring.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:26 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/25/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Ted Anderson
<CONTACT-EMAIL> tedanderson@mindspring.com
<ADDRESS1> 1909 Price Creek Road
<CITY> Chapel Hill
<STATE> nc
<ZIP> 27516
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> I urge the FCC not to define a "Broadcast Flag" or to mandate its use in digital systems. This ruling would unreasonably restrict the ordinary and proper use of computer and other systems that handle video data. It is the wrong approach to protecting the interests of copyright holders.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of parkert@uclink.berkeley.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:26 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/26/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Parker Thompson
<CONTACT-EMAIL> parkert@uclink.berkeley.edu
<ADDRESS1> 2158 stuart st
<CITY> berkeley
<STATE> ca
<ZIP> 94705
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Hello,

I am writing you because I have been following closely proposed regulations that would require hardware manufacturers to respect a 'broadcast flag' that could be included as part of digital broadcasts to require these devices to disallow copying. While on the face of it this seems like good policy (we want to protect copyright works and authors), I believe that ultimately it is overly restrictive. The broadcast flag leaves no room for fair use, which is critical to intellectual freedom and the creation of new works.

The only people this law benefits are content distributors, who are much more concerned with controlling distribution than they are with protecting artists, or assuring that we receive high quality content. Consumers lose choices, control, and rights that apply to existing media.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

pt.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jmeagher@patriot.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:26 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/26/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> John Meagher
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jmeagher@patriot.net
<ADDRESS1> 9107 Courtley Ct.
<CITY> Fairfax,
<STATE> VA
<ZIP> 22031
<PHONE> 703 280 4842
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC
Ref: FCC NPRM 02-230

Dear Commissioners:

I would like to register my emphatic opposition to the proposed "Broadcast Flag" regulation which would increase the cost and complexity of multimedia equipment while decreasing functionality.

I am a believer in the concept of open source software, which has enabled millions of people to collaborate in the development and free distribution of tools, applications, and intellectual works to the great benefit of all involved. The internet, largely built on this model has contributed immeasurably to society and changed the lives of all of us for the better.

It has also, along the way, aided in the promotion, distribution, and greatly enhanced the utility of many excellent proprietary products, e.g. Microsoft Office, while at the same time nipping at their heels enough to keep them somewhat attentive to quality, support, and cost issues.

None of this would have happened if the available tools were crippled to prevent "unofficial" people from tinkering with the code and applications in the linux, GNU and OpenBSD domains. A major attraction of PCs and networking to young people is their limitlessness, the fact that as long as you play by the technical rules required to move the information, (those dictated by engineering and physics) you can innovate to your heart's content. A lot of dedicated work is done this way that ends up in the public domain, with all costs born by the innovator.

Now we have an interested industry trying to poison the technical environment by forcing us to purchase tollbooths embedded in our equipment, which restrict what we can do with it, in the belief that nothing would change except that we would start paying the tolls in order to travel a route we are accustomed to travel for free.

It ain't gonna happen. A way around will be found within a couple of months, but the market will be stifled, perhaps for years, while the energy that might have flowed in creative efforts is diverted to manage lawsuits, recalls, retrofits, incompatibilities, etc.

Please, please, keep the lawyers out of the equipment design. The engineering and user community will be more than happy to stay out of litigation.

Sincerely,

John Meagher

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of master_lunn@hotmail.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:26 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/26/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Corey Schimpf
<CONTACT-EMAIL> master_lunn@hotmail.com
<ADDRESS1> 4320 Mill Pond Circle
<CITY> Perry
<STATE> Ohio
<ZIP> 9545
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Dear commissioner,

I am writing concerning the Broadcast Flag. I do not believe its efforts will ever come to fruition, and rather they are going to inhibit the ability of many many customers in this country. Piracy is something that is going to occur no matter the rules, laws, or punishments we create. I do not condone these actions, but this ruling is not going to prevent them.

I am more concerned as a customer, that with these laws I will have to upgrade my equipment, which for one I cannot afford. But finicial woes is not the only dilemma, when these type of laws are instituted there is a wide array of abusive possibilities formulated for hardware and software businesses, even collaborations thereof.. Since for instance, new dvds will only play on "compliant" hardware, well what if a company like Sony who makes both dvd players and dvds made it so their dvds will only play on their dvd players. This would hurt competition greatly. It would also prevent new companies with innovative ideas to enter the market, since dvds may only play on certain players.

I'm afraid thats only the start of the possible abuses. I hope you will keep in mind the control existing companies could receive from this ruling and many other factors that it may effect. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Sincerely,
Corey Schimpf

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jpowers@in3.org
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:04 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/26/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Jack Powers

<CONTACT-EMAIL> jpowers@in3.org

<ADDRESS1> 405 Fourth Street

<CITY> Brooklyn

<STATE> NY

<ZIP> 11215

<PHONE> 718-499-1884

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I am very opposed to the so-called "Broadcast Flag" that will erase the fair use rights over television programming that American citizens have always enjoyed. The corrupt use of the federal government -- both executive and legislative branches -- = to advance the monopoly power of a small number of commercial media companies is contrary to every principle of copy rights and responsibilities that has made this country the thought leader of the world. I urge you to eliminate the "Broadcast Flag" and stop these efforts to pick winners in the digital media marketplace.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of sera@fhwang.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:04 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/26/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Francis Hwang
<CONTACT-EMAIL> sera@fhwang.net
<ADDRESS1> 5 Judge St #2R
<CITY> Brooklyn
<STATE> NY
<ZIP> 11211
<PHONE> 917-776-4300
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> My concern is that the broadcast flag will shackle and constrain technology innovation in the U.S. -- I don't look forward to a future where I have to travel abroad to see the next big thing ...

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of strangemind@mac.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:03 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/27/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> baron chat
<CONTACT-EMAIL> strangemind@mac.com
<ADDRESS1> 2019 delaware street #a
<CITY> huntington beach
<STATE> ca
<ZIP> 92648
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> the fcc exists to serve the public interest, not the interests of hollywood or the entertainment/movie industry. please do not lose sight of that as you embark on your decision making process. you should, and must vote against the broadcast flag.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of gp-lists@p3k.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:03 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/27/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Gary Pupurs
<CONTACT-EMAIL> gp-lists@p3k.net
<ADDRESS1> 9800 Leatherfern Ter #303
<CITY> Montgomery Village
<STATE> MD
<ZIP> 20886
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I am very strongly opposed to the adoption of the "broadcast" flag to prevent fair use of digital broadcast television. I own a ReplayTV personal digital video recorder, and have found it indispensable to our TV-watching lifestyle. I often transfer shows over to my computer so that I can watch them while I work, allowing my wife to watch what she wants on her screen. The quality is excellent, and much more convenient than VCR programming.

In addition, I occasionally transfer 30-60 minute episodes of shows to my PocketPC, which I then watch while travelling to work on Metro. The broadcast flag would prevent me from doing so, a fair use right I believe I have.

I'd also like you to know that we own and have purchased over 250 DVDs in our movie collection. While I do own a DVD burner and use it to archive some of our recorded shows (there is limited space on the ReplayTV box), they typically are shows which will never be available on DVD. You should also be aware that we have purchased several TV series DVD sets that have become commercially available. Why? The quality is better, it is far more convenient than burning my own discs, and the added special features have made it worth it.

I am opposed to any heavy-handed FCC regulations that would cater to the "big money" entertainment industry and forsake the "fair use" provisions of current and emerging technologies, which are only of benefit to consumers. This "broadcast flag" would change how I can use my equipment, rendering it useless.

I remind you of your primary responsibility to the general public, and not to special interests, and strongly urge you to abandon efforts to force this unwanted restriction onto American viewers.

Sincerely,

Gary Pupurs
Montgomery Village, MD

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mlzavar@owu.edu
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:03 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/27/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> marsha zavar

<CONTACT-EMAIL> mlzavar@owu.edu

<ADDRESS1> 43 rowland avenue

<CITY> delaware

<STATE> ohio

<ZIP> 43015

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I can't believe that you would consider passing the "Broadcast Flag" proposal. This would allow Hollywood and it's friends to control our lives even more than they do now. We are suppose to be a "free" democratic society without these kinds of controls. I urge you to not pass this proposal.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of rge@@70Tech.net
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2003 12:03 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/27/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Roger Erickson
<CONTACT-EMAIL> rge@@70Tech.net
<ADDRESS1> 22515 Whites Ferry Rd
<CITY> Dickerson
<STATE> MD
<ZIP> 20837
<PHONE> 301-349-0798
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> I am concerned that the broadcast flag will interfere with consumers ability to make personal copies of DTV content for their own & family entertainment or educational use. Viewers cannot be parked in front of a TV 24hrs a day. Therefore, for a variety of reasons, many citizens now routinely tape content of interest to for later viewing. This "store & hold" capability is important for entertainment as well as educational purposes.

This fundamental right to capture and review content is threatened by the broadcast flag when combined with the DMCA.